

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 138-143, 145-150, 152-157 and 159 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (US 5,815,226, hereinafter "Yamazaki '226") in view of Yanagawa (US 5,734,451, hereinafter "Yanagawa").

Claims 144, 151 and 158 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamazaki '226 in view of Yanagawa and further in view of Yamazaki et al (US 5,814,834, hereinafter "Yamazaki '834").

Claims 160-163 and 165 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamazaki '226 in view of Yanagawa and further in view of Kenichi et al (JP 4-163528, hereinafter Kenichi).

Claims 164 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamazaki '226 in view of Yanagawa and Kenichi and further in view of Yamazaki '834.

Applicants teach commonizing the common electrode and the black matrix in a pixel region (page 21, lines 18-24). The electric field applied to the liquid crystal is formed by the black matrix (acting as common electrode) and the pixel electrode (page 22, lines 18-24).

Yamazaki '226 discloses creating a retaining capacitor between a black matrix 316 and a pixel electrode (FIG. 4). However, Yamazaki does not teach that the black matrix is used as a common electrode, i.e., as the electrode used in combination with the pixel electrode to generate the electric field to be applied to the liquid crystal. Accordingly,

Yamazaki '226 fails as a primary reference, and therefore none of the combinations present a prima facie showing of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 138-165 are allowable.